ERIC Document Resume	See Instruction Sheet	DATE OF RESUME 8/4/65	DATE RECEIVED

A. PUBLICATION DATA

1. ERIC NUMBER	2. ORIGINATOR CONTROL NO(S).	3. IDENTIFICATION NO.
ED000393	7145	N.A.

DO NOT WRITE IN SPACE BELOW

4. AUTHOR(S):
Sala, John R.

5. TITLE OF DOCUMENT ABSTRACTED:
Inservice Development of Instructors

6. PUBLICATION TITLE:
Improving College and University Teaching

7. EDITOR(S):
N.A.

8. PLACE OF ORIGIN
ORG. U.S. Air Force Academy
ST. Colorado Springs, Colo.
CITY, STATE

9. PUBLISHER OR SOURCE
Oregon State College
Corwallis, Oregon

10. VOL.	11. PAGES	12. MO./YR.	13. TOTAL PP.
VIII	43-45	Spr. 60	3

TELE. EXT.
INST/LOC CODE

MICROFILM COPY AVAILABLE
YES ☒ NO ☐

COPYRIGHT GRANTED
YES ☒ NO ☐

COPYRIGHT RELEASE FILED
YES ☒ NO ☐

TYPE OF REPORT
PROPOSAL ☐
IN-PROGRESS ☐
FINAL ☒
FOLLOW-UP ☐

OTHER ERIC REFERENCES:

ERIC SATELLITE CODE

B. INDEXING DATA

14. SUBJECT AREA

15. TYPE OF ENDEAVOR

16. INDEXING TERMS (6-12)
teacher edu. Y-20
professional edu. P-20
programs P-22
graduate edu/ S-04
effectiveness G-12
teachers Y-21

17. ABSTRACT (MAX 250 WORDS)

Air Force Academy's inservice professional development program of instructor improvement. Faculty members are encouraged to take additional graduate work at neighboring institutions.

ERIC No.

18. SOURCE OF ABSTRACT

C. FUNDING DATA

19. SUPPORTING ORGANIZATION

20. DIVISION OR DEPT.

21. CONTRACT NO.
PROJECT NO.

22. TOTAL COST OF PROJECT

23. DURATION OR PROJECT

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Office of Education

ERIC Form 1

Improving College and University Teaching Spring 60 Vol VIII No 2
Oregon State College
Corvallis, Oregon

Inservice Development of Instructors

Licutenant Colonel John R. Sala is professor and head of the department of history at the United States Air Force Academy. He is broadly educated: bachelor's degree in Spanish (Bethany College), master's degree in English (West Virginia), Ph.D. in history (Chicago). He has studied at Union Theological Seminary and has completed all requirements but dissertation for a doctorate in education (Missouri). World War II service included duty in both this country and England. He was executive officer of the academic division of the Army University in England, later deputy chief and chief of the education branch of the Office of Military Government, Berlin. He later was director of the Strategic Air Command Instructor Training School and chief of training for Air Force ROTC on the Air Staff in Washington, D. C. He describes features of faculty improvement on his campus that could well have wider adoption.

By JOHN R. SALA

THE FEASIBILITY and hope for success of an in-service professional development program in higher education are conditioned by the following considerations:

- **What is the level of professional training and experience of the instructional staff?**
- **To what extent does the institution emphasize the importance of instruction as over against research, extension work, and the like? Does institutional policy support programs of instructor improvement?**
- **To what degree do department heads, deans, and other persons charged with the administration of instruction have actual counseling or supervisory authority over content and method of classroom instruction?**

The United States Air Force Academy presents an unusually flexible situation for experimentation in the improvement of instruction in higher education. This is a broad statement which requires explanation.

The Academy is the newest of our large higher institutions. It has just graduated its first class. As a 'come-lately' institution it has been in the fortunate position of being able to draw on the experience of other institutions of higher education everywhere. It has been free to develop its educational program outside any compelling reference to custom or vested interest. It has enjoyed and profited from the counsel of the finest educational talent in this country. There has been the keenest awareness that the early years are the easiest years to experiment and to initiate; and that the nature and spirit of the enterprise are largely fixed in these early years.

The program of the Academy, of course, has not developed completely outside the long and honored educational tradition of the Military and Naval Academies. Perhaps nowhere has the honor system, for example, been applied more effectively and inspiringly to the educational process than at these Academies. The Air Force Academy, therefore, appropriated and applied the honor system without important change. To have done otherwise would be to cut ourselves off from the best of the tried and proven. At the same time, however, the Academy has been in the enviable position of being able to develop and initiate programs based on clearly defined objectives.

From its inception all members of the academic faculty have been career officers drawn from the active Air Force. There are no civilian instructors. This policy rests on many excellent reasons, chief of which is the professional nature of Academy instruction. Too, the Academy seeks to produce a career-committed officer, and teaching by example carries its own strong impact. All of these officers come to the faculty with at least a master's degree in their teaching subject. A quarter to a third of the teaching staff hold the doctorate. All faculty, with the exception of a limited number of statutory permanent professors, serve a four-year tour.

The instructional staff is drawn from a wide variety of sources. Many highly experienced, mature college and university instructors were brought into the then Army Air Corps in 1942 through the recruiting efforts of the so-called Snyder Board; and some of them have stayed in the active force. Other officers have had four years of collegiate teaching on Air Force ROTC faculties, and have taken extensive graduate work in spare time. The largest source of instructors, however, is through the Air Force Institute of

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education
This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

ED000393

Technology. This unique institution, after review of personnel recommendations from the Academy, places brilliant, scholarly minded junior officers into the graduate schools of the universities. Upon completion of the degree, they are assigned directly to the Academy faculty. Other faculty members have obtained education and experience through off duty graduate programs offered by many of the higher institutions.

These varied sources of the staff indicate a need for in-service training to weld the faculty into a well-oriented, functioning team. But why a team? Why not let each instructor go his own way and teach to match his fancy? The answers lie within the objectives and procedures of the Academy itself. All service academies have clear-cut goals aimed at professional training. Those goals at the Air Force Academy are not of the 'nuts and bolts training' type; emphasis is firmly upon broad principles of general education. Within this emphasis, however, instruction is guided and problems posed which are directed toward preparation of the cadet to assume intelligent leadership in his profession. This is a major reason for the firm policy that all instructors shall be career (though not necessarily regular) officers on active duty. It means, too, that the content of instruction takes certain distinguishing directions which differ from instruction in the same subjects in higher institutions with undifferentiated goals. As a result, there is special need for in-service development in the direction of understanding what these special goals are and how best to achieve them in instruction.

This team approach is not aimed at 'togetherness' in instruction. The older era of the academies, when identical material was taught to every class section in the same lesson (if such a condition ever existed, which I doubt) is long since gone. In the Air Force Academy cadets are sectioned several times a year in each course upon demonstrated ability *in that course*. This sectioning would be meaningless unless the depth and breadth of instruction, even the fundamental approach, were different for top sections from that of the lower. This means that instructors must and do have wide latitude within the general professional objectives of the Academy. Within this latitude, however, there must be a solid core of common educational experience for all cadets. One clear objective of in-service development then, is to help the instructor find a constructive combination of freedom and order in the classroom.

Programs of instructor improvement are energetically supported by the 'front office' of the Academy. The most cogent aspect of this support lies in the fact that instruction is considered the primary duty of all of the officer staff under the Dean of Faculty. Promotion recommendations are based almost solely on excellence in the teaching function. The Dean himself is a primus inter pares professor and department head. All department heads must teach at least one section, and some teach more. Recently this idea was emphasized in an unforgettable way when the Superintendent himself went into the regular history classroom to teach the lesson on Objectives and Strategy of the Civil War. When a 'college president' underlines the importance of teaching *by* teaching, not just talking about teaching—the faculty's respect for its job and its president increases.

This does not mean that research and writing are discouraged; on the contrary, every tool is put in hand to do such work. There is never any question, however, that the work of the classroom comes first.

Since the classroom is the payoff, every encouragement to professional growth in teaching is provided. Departmental conference rooms are beautifully equipped as departmental libraries. Carrels in the main library are set aside for faculty use. Monthly faculty meetings are closely held to a subject of major educational interest to the staff as a whole. Attendance at professional meetings is encouraged. Orientation of new instructors in a two-week summer training session is routine.

Almost unique in higher education in America is the classroom supervisory function within the academies. In the armed services no instructor is under the illusion that his classroom is his castle. He knows that he may be visited and his instruction evaluated at any time. He must teach as if the Chief of Staff might walk in that classroom door—as indeed he might! In fact, department heads and their course chiefs do a great deal of classroom supervision. Their own classroom duties are lightened to give time for this function and the personal conferences that result.

Staff members are encouraged to take additional graduate work at neighboring institutions, and many do. From time to time outstanding people in their fields are brought in to consult with departmental staffs on special course content and instructional problems.

One final point should be made very clear. In-

ED 000 393

Adjustment vs. Intellectual Achievement

Convictions are repeatedly expressed that we should expect more of students, that we underestimate their capacities. Trueblood and Mayer have both said it in recent books (see review in Winter issue, "The Vision of Excellence") and an associate professor of psychology at the University of Redlands says it in the following article in which he supports his case with the findings of his own discipline. Graduate of two universities (A.B., Denison; Ph.D., Chicago), he has held both military and industrial positions as a psychologist, has been a faculty member at Drake University, has published about thirty research papers, has contributed a score of lectures, papers, and conference discussions, and has held notable scholarships, offices, and other distinctions in psychology and education. He rates Thurstone at Chicago the best teacher he ever had.

By JOSEPH R. ROYCE

MOST OF US are pleased that the country is aroused over educational problems, but the irony of the situation is unfortunately too serious to be amusing. Teachers and professors may well see better days both in terms of pay and instructional program, and we should be concerned about the scientific education of our youngsters, but not because of the Soviet's Sputnik. We should be concerned because we care about the personal development of our sons and daughters. The fact that we will respond to the crying need of developing significant education for our youngsters only because we now have real technological competition is a deep and bothersome indictment of the shallow mentality of the contemporary American mind. We finally are about to pursue a proper course of action, but for the wrong reasons! We are about to pay the Ph.D. college professor a decent salary, not because he is a valuable asset to the advancement of knowledge and the promotion of much that is good about man and his civilization, but because it is now obvious that the "egghead" is really pretty practical after all, and we need the intellectual's brains in order to do a better job of fighting the cold war with the Russians. This is an evil reason for taking proper action. I trust we will do some soul searching and will think through our reasons for action.

What are we trying to do when we educate? The dictionary states that to educate is "to develop and cultivate mentally or morally" and "to fit for a calling by systematic instruction." A typical liberal arts college catalog states that its aim "is to educate the heart as well as the head, and to develop the student physically, intellectually, and morally." Some collegiate institutions are trade schools or technical colleges, some are finishing schools, some stress military education, and some claim to be primarily concerned with liberal education. The existence of this variety of educational institutions suggests that we are trying to do many things when we educate, including preparing students for life, preparing them for a career or job, and preparing them for getting along with other people. All of these goals are desirable, and we need all types of institutions in order to meet these goals. I shall confine my remarks primarily to liberal arts education.

WHY ARE MANY OF US so concerned about the state of affairs on the contemporary American campus? What is it that disturbs us? Perhaps we can get a clue to what is disturbing if we contrast the contemporary European student with the contemporary American student. In essence, the former is a student and the latter is not.

In-Service Development—*continued*

service growth programs at the Academy are not confined to improvement of teaching methods. Every department pursues programs aimed at broadening and deepening knowledge of the subject matter. No method, however enlightened or effective, can be substituted for competence in the field. The Department of History, for example, has just completed a weekly series of staff discussions, based on specially prepared papers by staff members, of the philosophy of history of Ranke, Treitschke, and Spengler. This is being followed by series on British, French, and American historians.

The Air Force Academy is not doing anything that has not been tried elsewhere before. It is, however, trying to make the most of a flexible and challenging situation to develop forward-looking programs of in-service development for its entire staff.